22 Dec. 1922, and this Metter being heard before the Levil Ordinary and Levillia upon the 22 Alexander Mill, William Ross and David Butter, the present Baillies of the Burgh of Montrose, on behalf of themselves and the other Magistrates and Councellors of the Said Burrough, APPELLANTS.

Robert Reid, James Coutts, George Morrison, James Smith, John Adam, John Hutchin, Alexander Strachan, Robert Ramfay, Robert Reid and David Buchannan, RESPONDENTS.

## thing to oblige the Appellants to enter into a Juliife arion of that A 2 ion, when The Appellant's CASE.

been guilter of an illegal Act, whatever inducate that might have HAT the Day of the annual Election of a Provoft, Magistrates and Town-Councel of the faid Burrough being on Wednesday before Michaelmass Day, an Election was accordingly made upon that Day 1722, whereby James Scot of Logie was regularly elected Provost of the said Burrough, as were also the Appellants Baillies and Councellours, and T

That upon such Election the said Provost and the Appellants entred into the Exercise of their respective Offices, and so continued for some time without any and the continued for some time without any Difturbance. The north of the north of the north man and the hold gold

That the Respondents brought their Action of Reduction and Declarator, in order to have the Act of Election of the said James Scot and the Appellants declared void and null, upon pretence that the faid James Scot had upon the Day of Election illegally imprisoned four of the Electors, contrary to the Freedom of Elections, and that no Election could be unless at a Meeting of the Majority of the Electors; but the the Number of Electors in this Burrough be nineteen, there were present at the Election of the said James Scot and the Appellants only nine; so that the said Election was void met and yard bas dead A bas nothin

That the Respondents not only prayed the Election of the Appellants to be fett aside, and that the said James Scot should be declared incapable of holding any Office in the faid Burrough in Time coming, but likewife infifted that the Respondents might be declared to be the only legal Magistrates and Councellors acquainted with them, they may not be lamished with or digurden bis and long acquainted with the same acquainted with the same acquainted with the same acquainted and same acquainted acqu fiftying them; and therefore the Appel and thould not be on

That in the Summons or Action brought, there is no Reason of Reduction infilted upon against any of the Appellants; but what the Respondents aimed at was to have the Act of the Election declared void. It was therefore infifted upon by the laid James Scot and the Appellants, that it was impossible to take any Steps to avoid the Act of Election of any of the Appellants, but what must at the same Time set aside the Election of the said James Scot, for there were no particular Disabilities charged against any of the Appellants, and the Election of the said Provost and the Appellants was made at one and the same time: But that Mr. Scot the Provost being a Member of Parliament there could be no Proceedings against him, and consequently every thing ought to be stayed as against the Ap- III pellants, till the Provost who was principally concerned could be obliged to encreupon be given beautiful them, and they thereby deprived of the linewins esumble of hi

Reafon L.

22 Dec. 1722.

This Matter being heard before the Lord Ordinary, his Lordship upon the 22<sup>d</sup> of December last was pleased to set Process against the said Mr. Scot during his Privilege of Parliament, but he sultained Process against the Appellants, and before Answer allowed the Respondents to prove their Libel, that there was not a Quorum at the Election of the Appellant Mill as Baillie, and that there was four of the Town Councel in Posson at the Time of the Election, and by a posserior Interloquitor of the 27<sup>th</sup> of the same Month, his Lordship was pleased to sustain Process against all the Desendants and allowed a Proof to be led against them except Mr. Scot.

27 Dec. 1722

That upon a Petition of the Appellants to all the Lords against the said Interloquitors, their Lordships were pleased to order the same to be heard in their own Presence; and it was then insisted upon by the Appellants, that the principal is not the only Reason made use of to let aside the Election, was a pretended illegal Act of the said Mr. Seot's in imprisoning some of the Electors to which it was not alleadged the Appellants were accessary, and since it was admitted they could not proceed against the said Mr. Scot, it could not but be considered as a great Hardship to oblige the Appellants to enter into a Justification of that Action, when at the same time neither the Appellants nor the Respondents could compell the said Mr. Scot to answer thereto.

It was likewise insisted upon for the Appellants, that supposing Mr. Scot had been guilty of an illegal Act, whatever Insluence that might have upon the Election of Mr. Scot himself, it could never affect the Election of the Appellants, who were not so much as charged to have had the least Concern in, or Accession to, such illegal Act.

That the faid Lords, however, were pleased upon the 19th of January last to pronounce the two following Interloquitors:

19 Jan. 1723.

The Lords having advised the Debate, find that Mr. Scot's Privilege cannot stop the Pursuers from insisting on that Reason of Reduction of the Election of the other Members, that Mr. Scot unwarrantably imprisoned some of the Members of Council during the Election; and

Found it relevant to annull the Election of the other Members, that Mr. Scot unwarrantably imprisoned some of the Members of Council during the Time of the Election.

Against these interloquitory Sentences the Appellants have brought their Petition and Appeal, and pray the same may be reversed for these Reasons:

the Electors: but the convenience i Lleckus in this Burrough be married

Reason I.

It feems very unreasonable to oblige the Appellants to justify an Act of Mr. Scot's, when at the same time there can be no Proceeding against Mr. Scot himsolf. He may have very good Reasons to alledge to support what he did, of these the Appellants may be intirely ignorant; or, supposing they should be acquainted with them, they may not be furnished with proper Vouchers for justifying them; and therefore the Appellants should not be obliged to plead to this Suit, till once Mr. Scot can be regularly proceeded against. Especially

- II. Since it is not so much as charged by the Respondents, that the Appellants were concerned with Mr. Scot, or accessary to the illegal Act said to be committed by him, it is then at least a very new Method of proceeding to compel the Appellants to justify this Act at the Hazard of losing their Right, when not only the principal, but the only Actor cannot be proceeded against: This will be attended with many bad Consequences. For
- III. Suppose that the Appellants being ignorant of the true Circumstance of the Case, and not having the proper Vouchers to justify the Fact, Judgment should thereupon be given against them, and they thereby deprived of their Right as Magistrates,

Magistrates, upon this Fact only; when at the same time Mr. Scot, when he comes to Plead, may give sufficient Reasons for to justify his Conduct, and thereupon be acquitted, whereby the Appellants would meet with an apparent Injustice; and therefore the full Case ought to be tried at once.

- IV. That supposing the Fact were proved against Mr. Scot, yet it seems highly unreasonable that any Act of his, to which the Appellants were not at all accessary, should be made use of to set aside the Election of the Appellants. Every Man ought to suffer for his own Faults; and therefore it is hardly to be conceived how Mr. Scot's Act can affect the Appellants.
- V. The Case is the same as if Mr. Scot had not been present at the Election, and the other Electors had proceeded to make a Choice without him; that Election no doubt would have been good: How then can the Presence of Mr. Scot, against whom there may be an Objection upon a Fact committed by him only, be made use of as a Handle to set aside the Act of Election, which of it self can subsist without the Intervention or Presence of Mr. Scot.
- That it is sufficient for the Respondents, in order to avoid the Election, to insist that some of the Members of the Council and the Electors were unwarrantably detained, nor was it of any Moment by whom, or by whose Direction, they were so detained.
- Were this Reason sufficient, it would be in the Power of any Person, though not an Elector, by unwarrantably detaining any one of the Electors, to set a-fide every Election of any Magistracy whatever, and introduce the greatest Confusion imaginable.
  - This is the more unreasonable in this Case, because neither by the Law, nor the Constitution and Practice of this Borough, are any particular Number of Electors necessary to be present when an Election is made; the Day for the Election is fixed, and the Persons elected by the Majority of the Electors then present, are, and always have been, considered as duly and regularly elected; and the Appellants were accordingly, without any Accession to any unwarrantable Act upon their Part, regularly elected by the Majority of Electors present, on the proper Day, and in the proper Place appointed for that purpose; and therefore hope they shall be quieted in the Enjoyment of their Offices, and that no Act of any other Person, to which they had no Accession, shall be made use of as a Handle to avoid their Right.

and orbers Respon

not

inld ins ares, Dun. Forbes. Will. Hamilton. 22 Dec. 1722.

This Matter being heard before the Lord Ordinary, his Lordship upon the 22<sup>d</sup> of December last was pleased to self Process against the said Mr. Scot during his Privilege of Parliament, but he sultained Process against the Appellants, and before Answer allowed the Respondents to prove their Libel, that there was not a Quorum at the Election of the Appellant Mill as Baillie, and that there was four of the Town Council in Prison at the Time of the Election, and by a posserior Interlognitor of the 27<sup>th</sup> of the same Month, his Lordship was pleased to sustain Process against all the Desendants and allowed a Proof to be led against them except Mr. Scot.

That upon a Petition of the Appellants to all the Lords against the said Interloquitors, their Lordships were pleased to order the same to be heard in their own Presence; and it was then insisted upon by the Appellants, that the principal is not the only Reason made use of to let aside the Election, was a presended illegal Act of the said Mr. Seer's in imprisoning some of the Electors to which it was not alleadged the Appellants were accessary, and since it was admitted they could not proceed against the said Mr. Scot, it could not but be considered as a great Hardship to oblige the Appellants to enter into a Justification of that Action, when at the same time neither the Appellants nor the Respondents could compell the said Mr. Scot to answer thereto.

It was likewise insisted upon for the Appellants, that supposing Mr. Scot had been guilty of an illegal Act, whatever Insluence that might have upon the Election of Mr. Scot himself, it could never affect the Election of the Appellants, who were not so much as charged to have had the least Concern in, or Accession to, such illegal Act.

That the faid Lords, however, were pleased upon the 19th of January last to pronounce the two following Interloquitors:

19 Jan. 1723.

The Lords having advised the Debate, find that Mr. Scot's Privilege cannot stop the Pursuers from insisting on that Reason of Reduction of the Election of the other Members, that Mr. Scot unwarrantably imprisoned some of the Members of Council during the Election; and

Found it relevant to annull the Election of the other Members, that Mr. Scor unwarrantably imprisoned some of the Members of Council during the Time of the Election.

Against these interloquitory Sentences the Appellants have brought their Petition and Appeal, and pray the same may be reversed for these Reasons:

- Reason I. It seems very unreasonable to oblige the Appellants to justify an Act of Mr. Scot's, when at the same time there can be no Proceeding against Mr. Scot himself. He may have very good Reasons to alledge to support what he did, of these the Appellants may be intirely ignorant; or, supposing they should be acquainted with them, they may not be furnished with proper Vouchers for justifying them; and therefore the Appellants should not be obliged to plead to this Suit, till once Mr. Scot can be regularly proceeded against. Especially
  - Since it is not so much as charged by the Respondents, that the Appellants were concerned with Mr. Scat, or accelsary to the illegal Act said to be committed by him, it is then at least a very new Method of proceeding to compel the Appellants to justify this Act at the Hazard of losing their Right, when not only the principal, but the only Act cannot be proceeded against: This will be attended with many bad Consequences. For
  - III. Suppose that the Appellants being ignorant of the true Circumstance of the Case, and not having the proper Vouchers to justify the Fact, Judgment should thereupon be given against them, and they thereby deprived of their Right as Magistrates,

Magistrates, upon this Fact only; when at the same time Mr. Scot, when he comes to Plead, may give sufficient Reasons for to justify his Conduct, and thereupon be acquitted, whereby the Appellants would meet with an apparent Injustice; and therefore the full Case ought to be tried at once.

- IV. That imposing the Fact were proved against Mr. Scot, yet it seems highly unreasonable that any Act of his, to which the Appellants were not at all accessary, should be made use of to set aside the Election of the Appellants. Every Man ought to suffer for his own Faults; and therefore it is hardly to be conceived how Mr. Scot's Act can affect the Appellants.
- V. The Case is the same as if Mr. Scot had not been present at the Election, and the other Electors had proceeded to make a Choice without him; that Election no doubt would have been good: How then can the Presence of Mr. Scot, against whom there may be an Objection upon a Fact committed by him only, be made use of as a Handle to set aside the Act of Election, which of it self can substitute the Intervention or Presence of Mr. Scot.
- Objection. That it is sufficient for the Respondents, in order to avoid the Election, to insist that some of the Members of the Council and the Electors were unwarrantably detained, nor was it of any Moment by whom, or by whose Direction, they were so detained.
- Were this Reason sufficient, it would be in the Power of any Person, though not an Elector, by unwarrantably detaining any one of the Electors, to set a-side every Election of any Magistracy whatever, and introduce the greatest Confusion imaginable.
  - This is the more unreasonable in this Case, because neither by the Law, nor the Constitution and Practice of this Borough, are any particular Number of Electors necessary to be present when an Election is made; the Day for the Electors necessary to be present when an Election is made; the Day for the Electors then present, are, and the Persons elected by the Majority of the Electors then present, are, and always have been, considered as duly and regularly elected; and the Appellants were accordingly, without any Accession to any unwarrantable Act upon their Part, regularly elected by the Majority of Electors present, on the proper Day, and in the proper Place appointed for that purpose; and therefore hope they shall be quieted in the Enjoyment of their Offices, and that no Act of any other Person, to which they had no Accession, shall be made use of as a Handle to avoid their Right.

to

not will

oold

ates,

Dun. Forbes.
WILL. HAMILTON.

as There are an early white the Source South South South South State of the South So and course to Present may and the sound Read of the party has Concern, and centes to recomb and an action of the second and all and all and all and the collections are the collections of the design of the collections of the coll

IV. That Repoling the fact were proved again the Cont. of it from tably methorestonable that any AC or his to which the Appollant west not at all access excellent, thought be hade use of a fee ande the shedlon of the Adnesting. E. very Man ought to luffer for his own Fantes; and therefore, it is harrly to be conceived how Mr. Sear's Ad can affect the Appellants. Xoras against the last later

Views The Cafe is the land as if her See had not been redient or the kinen, and the other Electors had projected to wante a Chelies with pathing, that R. heledrion no doubers only have been good: If a then call the release being, dent, A constitution where the set of the article a fact committee of the set of the set of the contract of the cont notes made at a crist at thingle ret to a fine the A.B. of Ekelion, which of the circum Added wichous the Lychvention or Presence of the dist. e asserble a fullification of that Arren was

or labeled the faithfields for the Ralponderes, in order to word the Blechlool, to infilt that force of the Members of the Council and the Electors were unvarrantably decrined, not was it of any Moment by whom, or by whole threandrion, they were to developed the part of the contract whatever infinence that exche have been the R

all eros Were this Reafon fulficlent, it would be in the Power of any Post in the gla ener as Elector, by nowassainably detailing any one of the Electors, to refide every Election of any Magatracy whatever, and introduce the greatest Confulion imaginable. SE 78 11 11 10

that the half cyle for any a come a fell trong that This is the more unreasonable in this Case, because welleries by the Law, nor the Confliction and Fractice of this Borough, are any parecular Number of Ele-Cors necessary to be presing when an Election is made; the Day for the Elewarman to the commence of the contract of the prefent, are, and always have been, confidence as dely and regularly thetels; did the Appellate were accordingly, without at a Accellion to any unwarran-oble Act pon grein Part, regularly elected by the Majority of Electors preand on the proper Place appointed for that purpose Place appointed for that purpose; End there Oc her they that he deleted in the Enjoyment of their Offices, and that no A& of By other Period to the Enjoyment of their Offices, and y other Perion, to which they had no Accelhon, thall be andle to avoid their Right. ppellants ID May, 1723. DENTS.

South against the Lorenza Louis Lorenza at Realest L WILL HAMILTON.

escrett Linguist Con-Control that Beautiful thought there, and

The second of the second of the second of the second The more than the second of the second of the the William Street Control Mention

he arrended much many but

Supporte that the Agreement leading agreement of the true Cyculations and the and not turned the trace of Nonchard to building the land the leader that the tempora to given against them, and they discreby Maritanza

and others,

, RESPON-

0

A

S H